REMARKS

[0010] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the

claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

• Claims 16, 18-21, and 30-31 will be pending following entry of the amendment

submitted herewith

• Claims 1-15, 17, 22, and 24-29 are canceled herein

No claims are withdrawn herein

Claims 16 and 18-21 are amended herein

New claims 30 and 31 are added herein.

[0011] Furthermore, new claims 30 and 31 are fully supported by the

Application, and therefore do not constitute new matter. Support for these new

claims is found in the specification at least at page 8, lines 7-16.

[0012] New claims 30 and 31 are allowable over the cited documents of

record at least because the cited documents fail to describe a first configuration

server being configured to receive a second request for configuration information

associated with a second re-locatable client device from the second configuration

server; and communicate the requested configuration information associated with

the second re-locatable client device to the second configuration server.

Cited Documents

[0013] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more

claims of the Application:

Serial No.: 10/806,977

Atty Docket No.: MS1 -1925US Atty/Agent: Robert L. Villhard -6-

lee@haves The Business of IP*

www.leehayes.com * 500.324.0256

• Deshpande: Deshpande, et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No.

2005/0108768

Pham: Pham, et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,143,288

• Durden: Durden, et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,380,258

• Finster: Finster, et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0149981

• Byers: Byers, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0161395

Cezeaux: Cezeaux, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0199184

Claims 1-22 and 24-49 Are Non-Obvious Over the Cited References

[0014] Claims 1-22 and 24-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

allegedly being obvious over various combinations of Deshpande, Pham,

Durden, Finster, Byers, and Cezeaux. Applicant respectfully traverses these

rejections.

Independent Claim 16

[0015] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that

the rejection of independent claim 16 is moot. Specifically, the various

combinations of Deshpande, Pham, Durden, Finster, Byers, and Cezeaux do not

teach or suggest the claimed, "receiving a second request for configuration

information associated with the client device from a second configuration server;

-7-

Serial No.: 10/806,977 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -1925US Atty/Agent: Robert L. Villhard

lee@haves The Business of IP*

www.leehayes.com * 500.324.9256

and communicating the requested configuration information to the second

configuration server from the first configuration serve."

[0016] Consequently, the various proposed combinations of Deshpande,

Pham, Durden, Finster, Byers, and Cezeaux do not teach or suggest all of the

elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests

that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 17-21

[0017] Claims 18-21 ultimately depend from independent claim 16. As

discussed above, claim 16 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore,

claims 18-21 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least

their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be

allowable for the additional features that each recites. With regard to Claim 17,

Applicant submits that its cancelation herein obviates its rejection.

Claims 1-15 and 22-29

With regard to Claims 1-15 and 22-29, Applicant submits that the cancelation of these

-8-

claims herein obviates their rejection.

Serial No.: 10/806,977 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -1925US

Atty/Agent: Robert L. Villhard

lee@haves The Business of IP®

www.leehayes.com * 500.324.9256

Conclusion

[0018] Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC Representative for Applicant

/Robert L. Villhard/ Dated: June 2, 2009

Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162 x5005) Registration No. 53725

Reviewer/Supervisor: Robert C. Peck (robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019

Registration No. 56826